

## **REMARKS**

This Amendment responds to the final office action mailed on March 12, 2007. Claims 1, 10, 19, 26, 28 and 35 are amended. Claims 2-8, 11-18, 21-25, 27, 29-34 and 37-39 have been cancelled. Claims 1, 9, 10, 19, 20, 26, 28, 35 and 36 remain pending and stand rejected. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### *Examiner Interview*

Examiner Nguyen is thanked for the courtesies extended during a telephone interview on June 19, 2007 with the patent owner's representatives, Stephen Perry and Joseph Sauer. During the interview, the pending claims and the cited Reiley reference (U.S. 2002/0016801) were discussed. The remarks contained herein further summarize the interview.

### *Claim Rejections*

In the final office action, claims 1-5, 9-10, 28, 30-32 and 35-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Reiley. In addition, claims 7, 17, 19-20, 22-25 and 34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiley in view of Yalovsky (U.S. 2004/0073872), and claims 8, 18, and 29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Reiley in view of Bourbakis (U.S. 2003/0145279). The patent owner respectfully disagrees with these rejections for the reasons previously stated. Nonetheless, in an effort to expedite prosecution of the instant application, the claims have been amended to further distinguish over the cited references, including the Reiley reference.

During the telephone interview, Examiner Nguyen agreed that the above amendments to the independent claims should distinguish the claims from the Reiley reference. For instance, claim 1 has been amended to further define the steps of "analyzing content properties" and

“analyzing content structure.” Specifically, amended claim 1 recites that “analyzing content properties comprises identifying differences in at least one of text formatting, paragraph alignments or indents, and paragraph sizes,” and that “analyzing content structure comprises identifying at least one of a table of contents in the electronic document, a plurality of spreadsheet worksheets in the electronic document, and a plurality of document pages in the electronic document.” Similar amendments are also made to the other independent claims. Clearly, these limitations are not disclosed or suggested by the cited references, either alone or in combination.

Moreover, as previously explained, the cited Reiley reference teaches only that a Web document can be transformed into a hierarchical representation from which a device-readable version of the Web document may be generated. In this regard, the content transformer parses the content of the Web document according to its “logical structures or elements.” (See, Reiley, paragraph [0038]). There is absolutely no suggestion of “selecting... summary entries... based on differences in the content properties.”

For at least these reasons, the patent owner respectfully submits that claims 1, 9, 10, 19, 20, 26, 28, 35 and 36, as amended, are patentable over the cited references and are in condition for allowance. Allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

JONES DAY

  
Joseph M. Sauer (Reg. No. 47,919)  
Jones Day  
North Point, 901 Lakeside Avenue  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
(216)-586-7506